

Remarks

Claims 19-28 are pending. New Claims 26-28 are added in this Response. Claims 23-25 have been withdrawn by the Office as being directed to non-elected species. For the reasons noted below, however, Applicant feels generic Claim 19 is allowable and, therefore, requests consideration of the claims directed to all species, including Claims 23-25.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 19, 20 and 22 were rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Smetana (4390119). Claim 21, which depends from Claim 19, was rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Smetana in view of Doninelli (5409174). The rejections are based on the Office's assertion that Smetana teaches an array of crossing scratches similar to that achieved by moving sand paper laterally back and forth against a slowly turning tape guide. This assertion is not correct.

Claim 19 recites a cross hatched surface texture, among others, that includes an array of crossing scratches similar to that achieved by moving sand paper laterally back and forth against a slowly turning tape guide. One example of this cross hatched texture is shown in Figs. 6 and 7. Smetana, by contrast, teaches a surface texture "formed with a multitude of adjacent *closed*, or *circumferentially bounded*, recesses arranged in a recurrent pattern ...." Smetana, column 2, lines 7-9 and Figs. 2-5 (emphasis added). The recesses in the cross hatched surface texture recited in Claim 19 are not closed recesses nor are they circumferentially bounded recesses. On the contrary, an array of scratches (recesses) similar to that formed by holding sandpaper against a turning tape guide is not closed or circumferentially bounded. Such scratches/recesses go around the guide.

The difference between the two textures is readily apparent by comparing Figs. 6 and 7 of the present application with Figs. 2-5 in Smetana. In Smetana, the closed/circumferentially bounded recesses are discrete diamond shapes (Fig. 2), squares (Fig. 3), circles (Fig. 4) and triangles (Fig. 5). The scratches in Figs. 6 and 7 of the present application, by contrast, run continuously around the surface of the tape guide. That is to say, the scratches are not closed or circumferentially bounded.

Claim 19, therefore, is felt to distinguish patentably over Smetana. Claims 20-22 are also felt to distinguish over the cited references due to their dependence on Claim 19.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 22 was rejected under Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office asserts that it is unclear how Claim 22 further limits the base claim (Claim 19).

Claim 19 recites a surface texture selected from a group of four textures. Use of any one of the four texture options infringes Claim 19. Claim 22 recites that the surface texture comprises the first texture option from Claim 19 (a cross hatched texture). Claim 22 is not infringed unless the first texture option from Claim 19 is used. Hence, Claim 22 further limits Claim 19. Applicant requests, therefore, that the Office withdraw the Section 112 rejection of Claim 22.

New Claims

Claims 26-28 are newly added and contain numerous recitations not taught or suggested in the art of record. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding office action.

Respectfully submitted,

Darrel Bloomquist

By

  
Steven R. Ormiston  
Registration No. 35,974  
(208) 433-1991